DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 249 HE 015 455

AUTHOR	Hall, Roberta M.; Sandler, Bernice Resnick
TITLE	Women Winners.
INSTITUTION	Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C. Project on the Status and Education of Women.
SPONS AGENCY	Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Women's Educational Equity Act Program (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Aug 82
NOTE	16p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R St., NW, Washington, DC 20009 ($2.00).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; *Awards; *College Students; Competition; Educational Opportunities; Evaluation Criteria; Federal Legislation; Fellowships; *Females; Grants; Higher Education; *Scholarships; *Sex Discrimination; *Women Faculty

ABSTRACT

Guidelines are presented to help institutions ensure women's full participation in campus-based and sponsored merit awards and prizes programs. Over 100 recommendations are designed to: explain why such awards and prizes can be particularly important for women students and women faculty; identify overt and inadvertent barriers to women's full participation in campus and sponsored awards programs; identify special problems faced by women competing for athletic awards and prizes and prestigious sponsored fellowships; identify special problems encountered by women who are older, minority, or disabled, and by women faculty applying for postdoctoral awards and grants; analyze the implications of various federal laws and regulations as they apply to awards and prizes; and provide detailed and pragmatic recommendations to ensure that awards procedures are fair and equitable for women on campus. Practices that may exclude women from award competitions are identified with respect to: attitudes toward women as candidates and winners, outreach for nominations and/or applications, awards criteria, nominating and judging applications; letters or recommendation, and interviews. The recommendations are designed to increase women's participation as competitors, nominators, and judges. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Project on the Status and Education of Women
Association of American Colleges
1818 R Street, N.W. Washington DC 20009 (202) 387-1300

WOMEN WINNERS

ED231249

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Project on the Status of Women
AAC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Project on the Status and Education of WOMEN

ASSOCIATION of AMERICAN COLLEGES
1818 R Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009 (202)387-1300

STAFF

Executive Director	Bernice Resnick Sandler	**Research Assistant**	Julie A. Kuhn
Assoc. Director for Administration	Mary De Mouy	**Staff Assistant**	Karen Seebohm
Asst. Director for Special Programs	Roberta M. Hall	**Staff Assistant**	Jean O'Gorman

WOMEN WINNERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1
TYPES OF AWARDS AND PRIZES 2
DEVALUATION AND THE AWARDS PROCESS: WHY BEING "A WINNER" CAN BE ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT FOR WOMEN .. 2
ATTITUDINAL BARRIERS: COMPETING AGAINST THE IMAGE OF THE "IDEAL FELLOW" 3
PROCEDURAL BARRIERS 3
Outreach 3
Awards Criteria 4
Nominating and Judging 5
Application Procedures 5
Getting Letters of Recommendation 5
Interview Procedures 6
ATHLETIC AWARDS AND PRIZES: COMPETING AGAINST TRADITION 7
OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS AND SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS: COMPETING AGAINST THE FELLOWSHIP NETWORKS 7
OLDER WOMEN: COMPETING AGAINST THE AGE BARRIER .. 7
MINORITY WOMEN: COMPETING AGAINST INVISIBILITY 8
DISABLED WOMEN: COMPETING AGAINST THE IMAGE OF THE "IDEAL" WINNER 8
FACULTY WOMEN: COMPETING FOR POSTDOCTORAL AWARDS AND GRANTS 9
LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS 9
SELECTED LIST OF AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 12
SELECTED LIST OF RESOURCES 12

INTRODUCTION

Each year across the country, colleges and universities give thousands of prizes and awards based on merit to their students. These prizes and awards vary widely, from an award for the most outstanding or promising student in an academic area, to a scholarship for foreign study or a fellowship for graduate work. Whatever its nature, such an award is often a "ticket to the future" because the individual who receives it is, in a sense, "anointed" as being uniquely competent in a particular field.

But, prizes and awards can do much more than merely confirm a person's talents: depending on the particular award, it may also help an individual in numerous ways, such as:

- providing financial aid (many awards are monetary);
- giving the awardee a competitive edge in applying for future schooling and employment (for example, an applicant for a position as an attorney with a prestigious firm who can list "Rhodes Scholar" as a credential on his or her resume may have a definitive advantage over other candidates');
- providing new experiences and the opportunity to meet with persons who may be important for future career activities (for example, the awardee may meet persons influential in his or her field at an awards dinner; former prize-winners may be helpful in opening doors to new awardees);
- affording the opportunity to gain specialized knowledge and/or learning experiences (such as an internship or funding for special research), and
- increasing the opportunity for personal growth and feeling of competence.

Furthermore, when awards are given to women, they serve other functions which go well beyond the individual who receives the award:

- prizes given to women increase the general perception by both men and women that women are indeed capable of achievement; and
- the women who receive the awards can be role models for other women, thereby helping to increase the aspirations of other women.

Thus, awards may play a critical role in a variety of ways to help advance women. Although women have made some gains in this area, procedures for granting awards may still contain invisible barriers which hamper their full participation. Nominators may be all male and less likely to nominate women, especially minority women; materials may inadvertently discourage women from applying by referring to all award candidates as "he"; and outreach may be limited so that few women are aware that they are eligible to apply. These and other barriers are discussed in detail later in this paper.

Today women are the new majority of students, and institutions need to evaluate their current awards and prizes procedures to make certain women students (and faculty) participate fully and, as mandated by Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, are treated fairly in all steps of the awards process. An institution whose women students have won prizes and awards benefits in the following manner:

- it indicates a commitment to women students as individuals of exceptional ability in scholarship, athletics, or other areas.
- it enhances the ability to recruit and retain women students. (One undergraduate institution, for example, emphasizes in its recruitment publicity that it has "graduated some [women] Fulbright Scholars."[2] Moreover, women graduate students who have received fellowships have significantly lower attrition rates than those who have not, and many observers attribute this as much to the institutional commit-

This paper was written by Roberta M. Hall, Assistant Director for Special Programs, and Bernice Resnick Sandler, Executive Director, Project on the Status and Education of Women of the Association of American Colleges. Special thanks go to Susan Crim, Dean of Student Development, Earlham College (IN); Margot Gill, former Director of Fellowships, Harvard University (MA); Jon W. Fuller, President, Great Lakes Colleges Association and panelist, Midwest Selection Committee, Marshall Scholars Program; Pamela C. Kramer, Director, Women's Programs, Polytechnic Institute (NY); Warren B. Martin, former Director, Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program; Phyllis Palmer, Director, Congressional Fellowships on Women and Public Policy, George Washington University (DC); and Caryl K. Smith, Dean of Student Life, and Chair, Student Awards Committee, University of Kansas. We also wish to thank Margaret C. Dunkle, Director, Health Equity Project (DC); and Marcia Greenberger, National Women's Law Center (DC) for their consultation on legal issues. While these persons provided invaluable information and recommendations, the views expressed in this paper are the sole responsibility of the Project on the Status and Education of Women. Project staff also contributed to the development of this paper, especially Jean O'Gorman, Staff Assistant and Julie A. Kuhn, Research Assistant.

ment and support such awards symbolize as to actual financial help.[3])

The increasing numbers of women undergraduates and of women graduate students provide an expanded pool from which institutions can select students who merit special honors. When an off-campus award includes substantial monetary aid for tuition and related expenses, the home institution benefits financially as well.

This report will provide guidance to help institutions ensure women's full participation in campus-based and sponsored merit awards and prizes programs* by:

- explaining why such awards and prizes can be particularly important for women undergraduate and graduate students (and for women faculty);
- identifying overt and inadvertent barriers to women's full participation in campus and sponsored awards programs in areas such as:
  - attitudes toward woman as candidates and winners
  - outreach for nominations and/or applications, including promotional materials
  - criteria
  - nominating and judging (establishing equitable procedures and including women)
  - applications
  - letters of recommendation
  - interviews
- identifying special problems faced by women competing for:
  - athletic awards and prizes
  - prestigious sponsored fellowships
- identifying special problems encountered by:
  - older women
  - minority women
  - disabled women
  - faculty women applying for postdoctoral awards and grants
- analyzing the implications of various federal laws and regulations as they apply to awards and prizes; and
- providing detailed and pragmatic recommendations to ensure that awards procedures are fair and equitable for all women on campus.

The large number of recommendations will enable institutions and sponsoring organizations to pursue those most appropriate to their individual circumstances. Institutions may also find the recommendations to be of use in evaluating grant and award programs. Many of the barriers which limit women's full participation in merit awards programs also limit the participation of other nontraditional students; therefore institutions are likely to find many of the issues and recommendations discussed in this paper helpful in increasing awards opportunities for many nontraditional student groups.

TYPES OF AWARDS AND PRIZES**

Merit awards and prizes differ in a host of ways, including the content and nature of the award itself, who gives the award, and the manner in which students become eligible to compete. Typical awards, for example, may recognize the student with:

- the highest grade;
- the best research project;
- the most outstanding original poem or story;
- the greatest academic promise in a given area;
- the greatest athletic achievement or potential; or
- the most promise for participation in foreign study.

Awards, prizes and merit-based scholarships or fellowships may be given by:

- institutions;
- individual departments;
- campus clubs;
- off-campus groups or organizations such as local clubs or national foundations; and
- bequests, wills or trusts, administered by institutions or off-campus.

Generally, individuals become candidates for awards in one of two ways:

- self-nomination (or direct application) in which a student learns about and applies for the award;
- nomination by others, such as a former winner, a faculty member, or a departmental or institutional committee (as is the case for many prestigious programs sponsored by off-campus organizations, as well as many awards that are departmentally or institutionally based). However, in some instances, awards are given automatically to a student who meets a particular fixed criterion, such as having the highest grade point average.

DEVALUATION AND THE AWARDS PROCESS: WHY BEING "A WINNER" CAN BE ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT FOR WOMEN

Women frequently lack self-confidence even when they earn better grades than men.[4] Too often, they feel they are "not on a par" with men or are "not taken seriously" either as students or as future professionals. Indeed, the old saying that "a woman must be twice as good to get half as far as a man" still contains a core of truth: women's competence and women's achievements have generally been undervalued by society at large, and individual women have often been judged primarily as if they were members of a "deficient" group.[5]

This sort of pre-judgement can easily skew an awards process in a number of ways. On the one hand, women who have internalized society's attitudes may find it difficult to believe they are likely to succeed, and may therefore hesitate to apply for awards, even when they are eligible. On the other hand, nominators and judges as well as others connected with awards programs may have difficulty in seeing women as suitable candidates: two recent studies, for example, found that male applicants for scholarships were judged more intelligent and more likeable than their female counterparts, and that male applicants for a study-abroad program were favored over female applicants with identical qualifications.[6]

Indeed, because of the devalued perception of women as a group, individual women often face more difficulty than individual men being evaluated fairly—especially when the evaluators are male[7] and are asked to **predict** future performance or "potential." However, when evaluators can rely on specific **past** performance and there is less room for inference, women fare somewhat better. In several studies, for example, items such as scholarly articles and paintings with a woman's name attached were rated lower than **identical** items ascribed to a man; however, when the items supposedly done by a woman were presented as "having won awards" or with a status title ("Dr.") attached,[8] then there was little or no sex-based difference in the evaluation.

Thus, for a woman student, winning a merit award can be a "certification of individual competence" which puts her more nearly on a par with men not only in her own eyes, but in the eyes of current classmates and faculty, as well as future

*As discussed in this report, a sponsored or off-campus award is one given by an off-campus organization, such as a national foundation (e.g., the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation) or a local group (e.g., the Rotary). Often, the institution or department nominates candidates, but the sponsoring organization selects the final winners. (In some instances, the institution may merely publicize the availability of such awards.) On-campus awards are those for which the institution itself administers programs and selects the final winners.

**For purposes of this paper, the terms "awards" and "prizes" are used interchangeably.

evaluators—such as graduate school admissions committees and potential employers. Moreover, winning an award can sometimes be of special help in providing entree into a network of scholars and other professionals (such as current and past winners, faculty and sponsors)—the sort of network that is often difficult for women to enter.

Barriers to women's full participation in merit awards and prizes programs fall into two related categories:

- **attitudinal barriers** on the part of nominators, judges, and (in some instances) women themselves; and
- **procedural barriers** in areas such as outreach, criteria, letters of recommendation, interviewing, etc., which—often inadvertently—disproportionately exclude women students as competitors or winners and exclude women as nominators or judges.

ATTITUDINAL BARRIERS: COMPETING AGAINST THE IMAGE OF THE "IDEAL FELLOW"

Male faculty are often more likely to encourage students of their own sex and to some degree, perceive women students as less capable, and professionally committed than men.[9] These perceptions are often heightened if the female student is married, has children* and/or is enrolled on a part-time basis—as is the case for many women returning to school, as well as for many students from special population groups. Despite the fact that many of these students do as well as or better than other students, many male professors may hesitate to invest time and energy in them.

The problems women face in competition for awards in general are often magnified in the case of prestigious awards. Many of the most prestigious merit prizes, including scholarships, fellowships, and grants for postdoctoral work, are sponsored by organizations outside the campus, such as private foundations and government agencies. The first extensive survey on women in fellowship programs, published by the Project on the Status and Education of Women in 1973, found that over 95 percent of the winners of **the most prestigious competitions** were men; further, men received 80 percent of the awards in **all the programs** surveyed.[10] Although the situation has improved since then, men still predominate to a large degree in many of these programs.

"At the crux of the problem," according to a report by the Women's Equity Action League, "is the image of the 'ideal fellow' which, despite administrators' denials, prevails in almost every program. Ask them what constitutes the perfect candidate and generally you will hear a description of a male . . ."[11] The report continues, "In talking with some fellowship administrators it was discovered that they found many 'problems' with women that they did not find with men" concerning women's professional commitment if they were married or had children, fears that if a woman were divorced she was "unstable" or if single would either have a "destablizing influence" on men in the program or "quit and get married."[12] Moreover, deans and others have sometimes expressed the view that while **institutional** financial aid (including some on-campus merit awards) might be offered to women and minorities as mandated by federal law, the more **prestigious national awards and prizes** should be reserved for "clear winners"—that is, as in the past, for men.[13]

Additionally, many senior professors—those who are most often called on to make nominations and write letters of recommendations for awards—may be uncomfortable working closely with women who wish to enter or to advance in the professor's own field because they may have difficulty seeing women as potential colleagues. The "male climate" frequently increases at the graduate and professional school level, where male professors are even more predominant, and the proportion of women students often smaller. One graduate school dean writes that male professors may often "nominate male students for fellowships or other coveted awards without realizing that female students are equally committed to their research."[14] Many women students—undergraduates and graduates alike—often report being "neglected" or "overlooked," particularly in the less formal aspects of student-teacher interaction. Women undergraduates are still less likely than men to be chosen as student assistants,[15] and women graduate assistants less likely to be given full responsibility for courses or leeway to pursue their own research.[16]

Thus, the doubts that professors may have about women students' commitment to career and/or research, coupled with the probability that many professors do not have the same kind of out-of-class working relationship with women as with men students, increase the likelihood that many professors may inadvertently overlook women when they think of students to nominate for awards and prizes, or when they directly encourage particular students to apply.

PROCEDURAL BARRIERS

OUTREACH: LETTING POTENTIAL CANDIDATES KNOW ABOUT AWARDS PROGRAMS

Sometimes women students are unaware that a particular awards program exists or that they are eligible to compete. Other times they may know of a program but be discouraged from applying because they do not believe women are likely to be treated fairly. For example,

- information may be primarily disseminated by an informal network of senior faculty, former winners, etc., from which women may inadvertently be excluded;
- language in awards announcements, brochures and official statements may exclude and/or discourage women—as, for example, when the candidate is consistently referred to as "he," or the goals of the program are stated in generically masculine terms, such as understanding "**man's** individual and collective history" and "the working processes of **his** thought and inner self"; and
- pictures in awards announcements and brochures may also exclude women—especially women from minority and other special population groups, such as older women and handicapped women.

REACHING WOMEN APPLICANTS: WHAT THE INSTITUTION CAN DO

- **Ensure that there are campus-wide procedures for announcing all awards competitions,** such as publication in campus newsletters, posting on bulletin boards, and disseminating notices in student mail boxes.
- **Ensure that announcements are publicized where women are likely to see them, such as in women's dormitories, the women's center, campus women's newsletters, etc., and that faculty who work closely with women students (such as women's studies coordinators) are notified.**
- **Publish a guide to campus and off-campus awards.** The Harvard University Office of Career Service and Off Campus Learning publishes *The Harvard Guide to Grants* for Harvard-Radcliffe students. The *Guide* contains information about the major national and university fellowships administered by that office, as well as other sources of grants and loans. Additionally, the *Guide* includes guidelines for writing applications and information about on-campus and other advisory resources available to students. (For ordering information, see "Selected List of Resources," p. 12.)
- **Include in all awards announcements and other publicity the statement that *women and minorities are encouraged to apply.***
- **Devise a checklist for language and pictures in awards announcements to ensure that they do not exclude women.** For example, the potential candidate should be referred to as **"he or she," "the applicant,"** etc. and the goals of the program should be expressed in similarly inclusive language such as "understanding **our** individual and collective history and the working processes of **human** thought."

*In contrast, marriage and children are likely to be an advantage for male students who may then be viewed as more "mature" and "stable."

- **Designate a senior faculty member or dean to be responsible for monitoring the language of awards announcements on an institution-wide basis.** (Often, the language used is determined by department chairs and varies greatly from one department to another. Chairs of departments in which few women have traditionally majored may be especially likely to use the "generic he"—thus further discouraging women from applying.)
- **Sponsor a meeting at the women's center or other appropriate place in the early fall of each year to discuss campus-based and sponsored awards programs with women students.** Invite previous women winners (students, faculty and alumnae) to attend.
- **Where appropriate, have the fellowship office or a faculty committee review the records of students to determine those eligible to compete for specific awards.** Notify each student of his or her eligibility. (Boston University's Office of Fellowships and Scholarships and Earlham College's (IN) Graduate Fellowship Committee do this for certain types of awards.)
- **Send announcements for all awards to residence hall advisors for posting, and prepare resident advisors to offer guidance on where students can get additional information.**
- **Encourage staff of the career planning office to inform students about available awards and prizes as well as how to plan and compete for them.**
- **Ensure that announcements for all departmental awards are prominently posted in department offices.**
- **Publicize the achievements of women winners on your campus through an awards dinner, an awards day, a special page in the campus newspaper, etc.** (Michigan State University, for example, has a Women Achievers Program for women students, faculty and staff who have attained special honors or achievements. Nominees and a brief description of their recent achievements are publicized in *The Michigan State University Woman*, and a reception is held at the end of the academic year.)
- **Include on all application forms the question, "How did you find out about this awards program?"** Responses may indicate differences in the ways women and men tend to find out about awards opportunities, and will help guide efforts to ensure that information about awards reaches women students.

AWARDS CRITERIA: HOW THEY MAY HAVE A DIFFERENTIAL IMPACT ON WOMEN

Certain fixed criteria for awards and prizes which are seemingly fair may nonetheless have a disproportionate impact on women students. Most awards programs, for instance, specify that **only full-time students** are eligible to compete. Women, however, are more likely than men to attend school on a part-time basis; thus, they are more likely to be excluded from competition—even for departmental prizes.

In addition to fixed criteria, "intermediate" criteria may also limit women's participation in the awards process. For example, commitment to earning a degree in a certain subject might be a legitimate criterion for a particular award. Because commitment cannot be measured **directly**, it might be assessed by intermediate criteria such as full-time enrollment and uninterrupted study. Ostensibly, these criteria are "sex-neutral." Yet these and similar intermediate criteria (such as marital status when used to measure commitment) may in effect impede the fair evaluation of women.

The interpretation of intermediate criteria is often subjective in nature. Additionally, some criteria are by definition subjective. In the absence of specific and concrete information to document an individual's prior achievement and potential, **or** in circumstances where criteria are ambiguous, evaluators are even more likely to downgrade individual women as compared to individual men.[7] Problems in weighing intermediate and/or subjective criteria are especially likely when there are no guidelines to help nominators and/or judges define them. Moreover, many criteria involving subjective elements have been established in terms of traditionally "masculine" activities and norms.

Commonly used criteria that may make women ineligible—or interfere with the evaluation of women—include those such as the following:

- **restriction of eligibility to full-time students.** (See discussion above. Some women's groups have questioned whether this and similar criteria may constitute a violation of Title IX if they disproportionately exclude women.)
- **age limits.** Many awards programs specify that a candidate must be in a certain age range (e.g., 18-22) or not above a certain age. Women students who have returned to college after raising their families are therefore more likely than men to be excluded because of age. (The imposition of absolute age limits may constitute a violation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975. See page 9 for further discussion.)
- **time of graduation** (e.g., June only). Some awards are given annually and restricted to those who graduate in June. However, women attending school on a part-time basis or those whose education has been interrupted are more likely to be "off-schedule" and to complete their year's work or earn their degree in January or August.
- **marital and parental status.** (See also discussion, p. 3.) Some awards are restricted to unmarried students and many women students—especially returning women—are directly excluded. (Such awards may be in violation of Title IX. See page 10 for further discussion.) Moreover, women students with children may be less likely to be considered for an award than other women students—or than men students who have families.
- **"well-roundedness."** This has often been measured in part by participation in athletics and outdoor activities where women have had limited opportunities.
- **"leadership ability."** Evaluators often rate leadership ability as demonstrated by holding top positions in student government and other campus organizations—areas where women rarely obtain the top post unless the organization is limited to women only;
- **"good character."** This criterion is often not defined; however, some awards competitions do attempt to offer guidelines. These may range from qualities usually associated with men, such as "courage" and "qualities of manhood"[8] to more neutral definitions like "more than usual openness to new ideas and a sensitivity to . . . fellow human beings."[9] Additionally, "good character" is often defined in relation to social and sexual mores which have been applied differently to men and to women. For example, lack of neatness in dress or a "loud" manner may be seen as a sign of questionable character in a woman, but not in a man.

STRATEGIES FOR ENSURING EQUITABLE CRITERIA

- **Evaluate the exclusion of part-time students to determine whether women are disproportionately affected.** Change eligibility requirements or set up comparable awards for students enrolled on a part-time basis.
- **Use class year (e.g., junior, senior, first year graduate student) rather than age to determine eligibility.**
- **Devise an awards calendar which incorporates January and August graduates (or students who change class years at those times) into a given academic year for purposes of awards and prizes competitions.**
- **Evaluate awards which limit eligibility to unmarried students to determine whether women are disproportionately affected.**
- **Examine awards criteria to determine which ones directly measure particular traits and personal qualities and which ones measure them only indirectly.**
- **Develop and disseminate a policy prohibiting the use of marital status as a "hidden criterion."** Distribute the policy with explanatory materials to nominators and judges in all campus-based programs.
- **Define criteria themselves as clearly as possible, and identify the underlying personal qualities they are designed to measure.**
- **Develop written guidelines with alternative ways for evaluating such qualities as "well-roundedness," "good character" and "leadership ability" in ways that do not inadvertently discriminate against women.** For example, good character and well-roundedness might both be evidenced in volunteer community service, while leadership and commitment might be shown in initiating a campus newsletter, setting up a support group, etc.

- **Where possible, develop materials for nominators and judges describing how sex and race bias might inadvertently affect the awards program.**
- **Keep data on applicants and recipients by sex and race.** (If no formal records have been kept for departmental prize winners, use sources such as the commencement program to compile past data.)

NOMINATING AND JUDGING: ESTABLISHING EQUITABLE PROCEDURES AND INCLUDING WOMEN AS PART OF THE PROCESS

Awards competitions which require nomination by a faculty member, dean or other sponsor can present special problems for women students. In some instances, women may be inadvertently excluded when nominations are offered without any established procedures. For example, in the case of departmental awards and prizes, the nomination procedure may be so informal that it is hardly a procedure at all: faculty members and department chairs may simply put forth the names of those students they know well, have worked with outside of class, or chosen as proteges. Particularly in the fields where women have traditionally been underrepresented (both as students and as faculty) eligible women may be easily overlooked. Moreover, the way in which nominators and judges are chosen may lead to an all-male committee, such as one composed of the heads of science departments or senior faculty. The relative lack of women in senior faculty, upper administrative or similar positions to serve as nominators and judges may also decrease women students' chances for being nominated and selected. Women faculty may be more likely than their male peers to "view other women as truly motivated to enter a profession since the female (faculty member) is herself highly motivated in her career."[20] Women faculty are also likely to have more out-of-class contact with both women and men students,[21] and thus to be particularly aware of those women whose current work and professional potential are exceptional.

ESTABLISHING NOMINATING AND JUDGING PROCEDURES: INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGIES

- **Ensure that there are established procedures for nominating candidates to be considered for departmental awards and prizes.** (For example, have faculty list all students who meet minimum eligibility requirements before initial nominations are made.)
- **Have faculty devise a "checklist" of criteria to help them rate potential candidates.** Putting criteria in writing may help identify discriminatory criteria that are not really relevant to the specific award, and may also help faculty sort out objective from subjective factors in appraising students. (See also page 4.)
- **Ensure that written materials soliciting faculty nominations for awards and prizes uses language that does not exclude women**—e.g., "A senior demonstrating excellence in the use of the English language in all aspects of his or her college courses . . ." "His or her" rather than "his" serves to remind nominators that they are asked to consider women as well as men.
- **When seeking nominations, include a statement that nominators are *encouraged* to consider women, including minority women and women from other special population groups.** Such a statement helps keep nominators from overlooking talented women from these groups.
- **When seeking nominations for institution-wide prizes and awards, contact persons and offices on campus likely to know eligible women, including minority women and women from other special populations,** such as staff of women's programs, minority programs, etc.

HOW TO INCLUDE MORE WOMEN AS NOMINATORS AND JUDGES

- **Evaluate criteria for eligibility to serve as a nominator or judge to determine whether they disproportionately exclude women.** Criteria which may have this effect include but are not limited to:
  - the requirement that nominators/judges be tenured or senior faculty
  - the requirement that nominators/judges be former winners of the particular competition
- **Establish in writing set terms of office for nominators/judges in order to open awards procedures to more faculty members.**
- **In departments where there are few or no women faculty, consider "borrowing" a woman from outside the institution who has expertise in the award area, or a woman faculty member from a related discipline** (e.g., if the Physics Department has no women faculty, a woman from a related field might be invited to help rate candidates). Alternatively, establish a campus-wide committee to help evaluate potential nominees.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES

Women may also have difficulty getting informal help in preparing application materials especially when faculty or former winners are primarily men, since they are often the best source of information about how a program operates and what interviewers, judges and others are looking for. However, the institution can take many steps to facilitate the exchange of this information.

PROVIDING GUIDANCE FOR WOMEN APPLICANTS: HOW THE INSTITUTION CAN HELP

- **Publish a guide or brochure that addresses questions women students—and women faculty—may have about campus-based and other awards and prizes programs.** (The National Institute of Mental Health, for example, has issued a brochure called "Questions Women Most Often Ask About National Institute of Mental Health Research Grants.")
- **Compile information, reports and letters from previous winners in a central location (such as the library, fellowship, or departmental office) and publicize their availability through women's programs, women's newsletters, etc.** (Harvard University's Office of Career Service and Off Campus Learning compiles such materials in its own library.)
- **Hold group meetings in the women's center, minority center, etc., to discuss general awards programs and specific awards.** Invite former winners to be guest speakers. (If a general meeting is held for all students, make sure to publicize it through women's programs, women's newsletters, etc.)
- **Identify and list women and men students and faculty who have formerly won particular awards and prizes and are willing to act as informal advisors for women students (or for women faculty) who are currently eligible for that program.** Maintain the list in appropriate offices, and distribute it to women's programs, minority centers, residence hall advisors and others.

GETTING LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

Many programs require letters of recommendation attesting to an applicant's or nominee's competence and personal qualities. These letters are most valuable when they come from senior faculty who know the applicant well, who write long letters that use "strong adjectives"[22] and emphasize the student's uniqueness and originality.[23] Unfortunately, many women may be at a disadvantage in obtaining such letters for reasons such as the following:

- **Since senior faculty at most institutions are male, women may not be as likely as men students to know established professors who are familiar with their work and who also know them as individuals.** Thus, women may have more difficulty than men in approaching senior faculty to ask for letters of recommendation—especially if they have had only formal, in-class contact with their professors and/or sense that their professors have limited views of women's abilities or commitment.
- **Professors of each sex may tend to write strong letters for candidates of their own sex.**[24] Since men greatly outnumber women faculty in senior positions, women students may suffer.
- **The language used in letters of recommendation may differ for men and for women, even when the referee intends to describe the very same qualities or attributes.** Women may be described less impressively in regard to both academic abilities and personal qualities (e.g., "bright" and "charming" for a woman, "intelligent" and "diplomatic" for a man). This problem may be exacerbated because words typically

used to describe women (such as "charming," above) already have lower status than those used to describe men.[25]

- **In some cases, as was common in the past, referees may still comment more extensively about a woman's personality, appearance and social demeanor, and focus less on her competence, achievement and professional potential, than they would do for a male applicant.**
- **Some faculty may still hold stereotyped preconceptions such as that women as contrasted with men are "competent, good students" but "not brilliant or original."[26]** This may interfere with professors' ability to perceive individual women accurately and to write strong letters on their behalf.

HOW TO ENCOURAGE EQUITABLE LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

- **Publicize the problems women may face in getting letters of recommendation by raising the issue with awards committee members and liaison officers, by publishing articles in the student newspaper, faculty bulletin, etc.** Invite student and faculty comment.
- **Provide all faculty with recommended guidelines for letters.** Include sample letters, examples of "neutral" language to describe personal qualities, and a list of words to be avoided.
- **Periodically compare letters written for men and for women.** A member of the awards committee or a person in the fellowship office might look at letters with a focus on questions such as the following:
  - are letters for men longer than letters for women?
  - are letters for men written in stronger language?
  - are family responsibilities mentioned in letters for women only?
  - are irrelevant personal characteristics, such as "attractiveness," mentioned for women but not for men?
- **Develop a guide for students on how to seek letters of recommendation.** (Harvard University has such a guide called "How to Get a Good Letter of Recommendation.") Distribute the guide to all students, and/or publicize its availability through women's programs, women's newsletters, etc.

INTERVIEW PROCEDURES

Many merit competitions—especially those for prestigious sponsored awards—require interviews as the "make-or-break" last step in choosing the final winner(s). Here, unfortunately, women candidates are particularly likely to face a number of barriers which men rarely encounter. One regional panelist for a major competition explains ". . . we are more often disappointed by the performance at the interview of women who seem very promising on paper. They are often not as sure of themselves or as confident about what they plan to do if they are awarded one of the scholarships."[27] Women often do not fare as well as men in this crucial step of the selection process for a variety of reasons. Some are clearly related to the formal interview procedures themselves; others are more subtly tied to such variables as the interview setting, the composition of the interview panel, women's probable lack of preparation for or experience with interviews and similar speaking situations, and women's own speaking styles.

Although awards programs have begun to include women interviewers, the majority of interviewers for many programs are male. While it is less common now than in the past, interviewers may still ask women disconcerting, inappropriate or illegal questions not usually asked of men, such as those relating to appearance, marital status, or family plans. Other elements of the interview procedure—for example, an interview with a single male interviewer in a hotel room, or a setting with a "men's club" atmosphere—may make it more difficult for women than for men candidates to feel at ease.

Moreover, because many women students often have not had as much experience as men either in interviews or in collegial discussions with male professors, they may find the interview situation uncomfortable—especially if the interviewers panel is comprised largely or solely of men. One researcher on women and fellowships noted that "Men might have some sense of the inhibiting effect of all-male review boards if they had to be interviewed by an all-female panel in order to get their jobs."[28] Additionally, women may put themselves at a disadvantage by talking hesitantly and softly, or by displaying other features of "women's speech" which may give a false impression of uncertainty, shyness, etc.[29] On the other hand, if they speak assertively, they may be criticized for being "aggressive."

Differences in men's and women's "style" may affect the evaluation of a female interviewee in other ways as well. Awards programs rightfully expect candidates to have a clear idea of immediate goals and ways in which a particular award will facilitate them—and women, like men, should be prepared to address these issues. However, in discussing long-range plans, women may be more likely than men to express an interest in several alternatives rather than to have a career-plan in lock-step for the next ten years. Additionally, women may express a desire to pursue professional goals that are oriented more toward performing certain functions or using certain skills than to attaining an especially visible position (e.g., "I want to gain litigation experience" rather than "I want to be counsel for a large corporation"). Thus, women's discussion of their goals may seem less clear, and the goals themselves "lower" than those of men.[30]

EQUALIZING THE INTERVIEW PROCESS

- **Where possible, ensure that interview panels include equal numbers of women and men.**
- **Ensure that interviewers are aware of ways in which male "styles" in speaking, statement of goals, etc. may skew the evaluation of a female interviewee.**
- **See to it that interviews are held in a neutral setting**—for example, the Office of Fellowships, the Dean of Students' Office, etc.
- **Conduct "mock interviews" for individual women (and men) students—and for interviewers—who request this help.** Several institutions now do so for students, often with members of the campus awards committee acting as interviewers.
- **Tape "mock interviews" to let students hear themselves responding and to aid women students in overcoming problems with tone, strength of voice, etc.** Earlham College (IN) currently offers all candidates this service through the Dean of Student Development's office.
- **Maintain interview reports, including comments by interviewees, so that all students will have access to them.** This system, currently in effect for sponsored programs at Harvard University's Office of Career Fellowships and Off Campus Learning, can be especially helpful for those women who may be less experienced with interview procedures.
- **Provide all interviewers for award competitions with a list of questions that are inappropriate and/or illegal.**
- **Prepare women students for the possibility that they may be asked questions concerning marital status, family plans, etc. Inform them that they are not obligated to answer these questions, suggest ways in which they can redirect the conversation, and help them formulate diplomatic responses,** such as, "I would not be applying unless I was certain I could handle the demands of the program." (Women who are asked such questions are often in a double bind: if they respond hesitatingly they may seem uncertain, but if they refuse to answer or respond vigorously, they may be viewed as "negative," "hostile," "radical," etc.—and hence, unsuitable.)
- **Publicize the availability of services designed to help students in interviewing for awards programs in ways likely to reach all women on campus.** For example, include articles or notices about them in women's newsletters, post this information in the women's center, minority center, etc.
- **Designate a staff person in the fellowship office or elsewhere to be responsible for handling concerns about inappropriate or illegal questions asked during interviews for awards and prizes.** Ensure that all women candidates know whom to contact should problems arise.
- **Establish a panel to scan interview reports of otherwise strong candidates rejected at the interview stage.** If the reports indicate a problem—such as inadvertent bias in questioning, an inappropriate setting, etc.—consider reinterviewing the candidate. (The Danforth Foundation has done this.)
- **Survey students periodically to get feedback about the interview process to determine if women encounter problems not faced by men.**

ATHLETIC AWARDS AND PRIZES: COMPETING AGAINST TRADITION[31]

Awards for athletic participation and outstanding achievement in athletics—such as trophies, letters, banquets, etc.—indicate the value an institution places on athletic participation. As one researcher notes, "[W]hen such awards are provided, they are often provided to male teams or male athletes only. In other instances, the awards or forms of recognition available to the men's teams are more valuable, more desirable or more prestigious than those available to women's teams."[32] Making a public campus effort to equalize athletic awards can demonstrate the institutions commitment to providing women with equal opportunities in athletics and to rectifying past inequities.

HOW TO MAKE ATHLETIC AWARDS EQUITABLE FOR WOMEN

- **Evaluate the current status of men's and women's athletic awards, and increase the number, value and prestige of awards to women if a disparity exists.**
- **Develop common standards for athletic awards for both men and women.**
- **Require that athletic awards and recognition be administered through an institutional office or committee which is equally representative of women and men.**

OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS AND SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS: COMPETING TO ENTER THE FELLOWSHIP NETWORKS

Awards for students which are sponsored by off-campus organizations often present special difficulties for women. These programs generally work through a network of formal and informal contacts– campus liaison officers who aid in the nomination of candidates, regional and national panelists who interview and select the winners. In the past, women were rarely a part of these groups. For example, in some instances judging panels have been comprised primarily or largely of past winners. Thus, to the extent that women were either previously excluded from competing for an award or less likely to win it, they have also been excluded from participating in the selection process.

Over the last several years, however, many programs have made a particular effort to open their procedures to greater participation by women and others who have been excluded in the past. Frequently, individual directors of sponsored programs have provided the initial impetus for change[33] and have sought to proceduralize those changes. Yet much still needs to be done. Sponsoring organizations and postsecondary institutions can work hand-in-hand to ensure that the gains in women's participation made over the last decade are not lost, and that additional progress is made.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS[34]

- **Compile data by sex of campus liaison officers, regional and national panelists, and winners to see if women's participation is limited.**
- **Include in instructions to liaison officers or campus representatives the requirement that they make a particular effort to reach women. Post announcements at campus locations and publicize competitions in campus media likely to be seen by all segments of the student body, including women of traditional college age, older women, minority women and disabled women.**
- **Ensure that announcements, news releases and other materials sent to liaison officers use language and pictures that include women from these groups.**
- **Publicize awards competitions where appropriate by sending information to places where potential women candidates will see them, such as centers for research on women, newsletters published by the women's caucuses of professional associations, and women's studies coordinators, etc.** (See "Sources for Outreach and Identification" in "Selected List of Resources," p. 13 for additional information.)
- **Instruct liaison officers to contact campus groups that have a special concern for the undergraduate and graduate education of women, minorities and other special populations** such as women's studies and ethnic studies coordinators, women's center staff, disabled student organizations, etc. These groups can be helpful in sugggesting candidates, identifying potential nominators and judges, and providing assistance with outreach.
- **Establish terms of office for liaison officers and panelists to avoid the formation of a closed network.**
- **Identify and develop a network of women to serve on national and regional judging panels.**[35] These talented women will also be visible symbols of women's achievement and commitment and thereby help change attitudes among judges and on the campus.
- **Ensure that having received a prestigious award is not the major or only criterion for serving on selection boards or panels.** (As noted earlier, such a criterion might perpetuate the effects of women's prior exclusion from the fellowship process.)
- **Establish guidelines to ensure that all interview panels include women interviewers.**
- **Require that interviews for your program be held in a neutral setting.** (Upon learning that women interviewees were often disconcerted by being interviewed in hotel rooms "where sometimes there was nowhere for the candidate to sit but on the bed," administrators of one program required liaison officers to use hotel meeting or conference rooms for all interviews.)[36]
- **Establish a network of minority women regional representatives to help identify minority women nominees.** (The Danforth Foundation set up a similar network to identify minority students.)
- **Emphasize a concern for increasing women's participation by discussing this issue at regional and national meetings for panelists and liaison officers.**
- **Include in the annual report information about the number of women nominators, judges, applicants and winners.**

OLDER WOMEN: COMPETING AGAINST THE AGE BARRIER[37]

Older women students—those who have returned to school to complete postsecondary studies or to earn graduate degrees—are especially likely to be excluded from consideration for merit awards and prizes.

Faculty attitudes toward older women (and men) students as potential candidates for awards and prizes may be complicated in a variety of ways. Some professors may mistakenly assume that mature students operate without a reward system and consequently don't "need" the kind of special recognition merit awards and prizes confer. Others may feel uncomfortable about evaluating their adult students in general—especially if the students are the same age as or older than the professor—and may even fear that older women students will see nomination for a campus award as condescending. Moreover, many faculty may feel that they themselves have little to gain by supporting the awards candidacy of an older woman who has outside responsibilities and whose career may appear foreshortened when compared with that of a traditional college age student. Additionally, some professors incorrectly view returning women as dilettantes looking for a way to occupy their time.[38] This perception may be heightened because many older women often have outside work and family responsibilities, and thus can attend school only on a part-time basis.

Partly because they may spend less time on campus than younger students, older women may be less likely to establish informal relationships with faculty. To many professors, an older woman attending school on a part-time basis may be "just a face in class" who appears at the beginning of the class period and disappears at the bell. Moreover, older women may not have the sort of informal relationship with **other students** that would give them a realistic perspective on their own standing in class. Thus, many older women may be unaware that their work is excellent, and consequently they may never consider applying for or seeking nominations for awards.

HOW TO INCLUDE OLDER WOMEN IN THE AWARDS PROCESS

- **Evaluate all awards programs to determine whether or not older students have been overtly or inadvertently excluded from receiving awards.**
- **Promulgate and disseminate a policy clearly indicating that age discrimination is prohibited in considering students for awards.** (See "Legal Considerations," page 9.)
- **If campus awards are currently limited by age, change the limitation to coincide with class year** (for example, "the junior science major with the best research project" or "the sophomore with the most potential in public speaking").
- **Encourage sponsoring organizations to drop fixed age limits.**
- **Designate a specific person on the faculty, in the dean of students' office, or in another appropriate campus office to act as an awards counselor for "nontraditional" women (and men) students. The awards counselor might be responsible for activities such as:**
  - consulting with older students about awards
  - encouraging eligible older women to apply
  - submitting the names of eligible older women students to awards committees
  - seeking feedback about problems encountered by older women who have participated in the awards process
- **Include staff who work with returning women—such as re-entry program coordinators—on nominating, judging panels.**
- **Hold meetings for returning women students—and for members of campus awards committees or staff of the fellowship office—to inform them about awards and prizes for which older women (and men) students are eligible.**

MINORITY WOMEN: COMPETING AGAINST "INVISIBILITY"

Minority women may encounter all the problems faced by **women** generally, as well as additional doubts about their ability and potential in academic areas. Like older women, minority women—and men—are often "ignored" or "overlooked"—especially in the less formal student-teacher interactions that can be so important to participation in the awards process.[39] Minority women often fare the worst on this score, both as women and as members of a minority group. For example, neither nominators and judges—nor minority women themselves—may think of **minority** women when "women" are mentioned in an awards announcement, and outreach strategies geared to "minorities" may be directed primarily toward minority **men.** Thus, minority women may "fall through the cracks" in the process of application, nomination and selection for awards and prizes. This is especially likely to occur if nominators, judges and others involved in the awards procedures are exclusively white and male.

HOW TO INCREASE THE PARTICIPATION OF MINORITY WOMEN

Many of the recommendations concerning older women can be adapted to increase the participation of minority women as well—such as **sending announcements to the minority student center, including minority women on nominating and judging panels,** etc. An institution can also take steps such as the following to ensure that minority women participate fully in the awards process.

- **Designate an appropriate person on campus to act as an awards counselor for minority women (and men) students.** (For a description of the kinds of activities this person might perform, see the similar recommendation under "Older Women: Competing Against the Age Barrier," see above.)
- **Be sure that awards announcements, as well as instructions to nominators, state clearly that women, including minority women, are encouraged to apply.** (Women from minority groups often feel that "women" means white women only.[40])
- **Contact minority women faculty members, ethnic study coordinators, and minority women administrators with information about awards programs. Request suggestions for candidates from them.**
- **Ensure that interviewers are aware of potential cultural differences in the verbal and nonverbal styles of minority group members to avoid a mistakenly negative interpretation of certain kinds of behavior.** (For example, silence on the part of black women may be misperceived as indicating sullenness; on the part of Asian women, it may be misinterpreted as showing timidity and lack of confidence.[41])
- **Keep data to determine whether minority women are only considered for some types of awards (such as those for athletics and drama) rather than for awards in other areas.**

DISABLED WOMEN: COMPETING AGAINST THE IMAGE OF THE "IDEAL" WINNER[42]

Disabled women students frequently encounter barriers based both on their sex and on their disability. They often face even greater general institutional invisibility[43]—especially so in relation to competition for awards and prizes. Established criteria as well as the attitudes of nominators and judges may make it difficult for disabled women to enter awards competitions, and may even exclude them from initial consideration.

As noted previously, until very recently many awards and prizes required participation in athletics as a criterion for eligibility; thus, many disabled students were automatically excluded. Related criteria (such as "physical vigor as shown by fondness for and success in sports"[44] in the case of the Rhodes Scholarship) continue to be used by some sponsored programs and thereby exclude some women (and men) students with physical disabilities.

Moreover, criteria such as "good character" and "well-roundedness" can also present special difficulties in the evaluation of disabled women, since involvement in school and community activities may be limited by physical barriers (such as transportation problems and lack of access to buildings) as well as by communication barriers (as in the case of a hearing-impaired student). Even seemingly absolute criteria, such as SAT and GRE scores (which are sometimes required for sponsored programs) may skew nominators' evaluation of disabled applicants. Although disabled persons are sometimes allowed additional time or specific sorts of assistance (such as readers) to take these tests, institutions are informed that scores cannot be interpreted in the same way as scores received by other students. Thus, nominators may be particularly uncertain about how to evaluate disabled students.

Criteria are only part of the problem, however. Nominators and others concerned with awards procedures may simply not think of disabled students when asked to consider candidates for awards competitions. Some faculty may be uncomfortable in dealing with disabled students, and disabled women on campus may have less informal interaction with faculty than virtually any other group. Moreover, since winners of awards are often seen in terms of an "ideal" student, those with disabilities may often be inadvertently overlooked in initial nomination procedures—even though their particular disability may have no relation to the qualifications for a specific award or to the performance of those activities for which the award is targeted. This kind of exclusion is not only unfortunate; it is also illegal. (See "Legal Considerations," p. 9.)

HOW TO INCREASE THE PARTICIPATION OF DISABLED WOMEN

Many of the recommendations concerning outreach and other areas which institutions can implement to include older women and minority women in the awards process (see above) can be adapted to include disabled women as well. Institutions may wish to make additional efforts in the following areas:

- **Designate an appropriate person on campus—such as the director of special learning resources or a disabled faculty member—to act as an awards counselor for disabled women (and men) students.** (For a discussion of what this person might do, see the similar recommendation under "Older Women: Competing Against the Age Barrier," p. 7.)
- **Examine criteria for academic and for athletic awards and prizes to ensure that disabled women and men are not excluded when their disability does not affect their performance.**

measure qualities (such as "well-roundedness") which include disabled students. Activities such as doing telephone calls for political candidates, establishing a collection of classical records, participating in wheelchair sports, etc., might be considered as evidence of well-roundedness. The awards counselor for disabled students—as well as disabled students themselves—might suggest more appropriate alternatives.

- **Where appropriate, devise alternative methods to help evaluate disabled students.** For example, a student with severe speech or hearing impairment might be given the opportunity to answer some or all interview questions in writing.
- **Where possible, include as nominators and judges disabled faculty.**
- **Ensure that interviews are held in accessible locations, and provide special assistance (such as an interpreter for a hearing-impaired student) if necessary.**
- **Compile data on disabled applicants and winners by sex to determine if some awards programs are more inhospitable than others.**
- **Set up a committee—including disabled women (and men) students—to identify the barriers they face in awards competitions and to suggest solutions.**

FACULTY WOMEN: COMPETING FOR POSTDOCTORAL AWARDS AND GRANTS

Faculty and other women often face many of the same attitudinal and procedural barriers encountered by women students in the application, nomination, and selection process for postdoctoral awards, research grants and prestigious fellowships, such as those offered by the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and the Guggenheim Fellowships in the Arts and Sciences. The first, for example, had only four women fellows in 1980-81 (8 percent of its total), one woman on the Fellowship staff, and 7 women of 33 reviewers.[1] The second, though geared especially toward persons well-established in their professions and thus older than recipients in many other programs (30-45), has traditionally awarded its fellowships mainly to men, and had no women listed on its selection committees in 1980 or 1981.[2] Other programs, such as the Alfred P. Sloan Research Fellowships in economics and management (which is currently making a significant effort to attract more women) had virtually no women participants until the mid-1970's, largely because nominating organizations almost exclusively submitted the names of men.[3]

Many of the recommendations in this paper may be useful to institutions, sponsoring organizations, and women faculty themselves in ensuring that **postdoctoral**, as well as undergraduate and graduate awards programs, afford women an equal opportunity to compete. Indeed, several programs which have adopted more flexible criteria in such areas as part-time/full-time status, faculty rank, etc. (such as the Mina Shaughnessy Scholars Program sponsored by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education) have a much better record in terms of women applicants and recipients. For a more complete discussion of fellowships available to women faculty, a statistical breakdown of major programs as well as suggestions for submitting an effective application and budget, see **Women and Fellowships 1981,** listed under "Selected List of Resources," p. 12.

[1] Judith Nies, *Women and Fellowships 1981*, Women's Equity Action League, Washington, DC, 1981, p. 15.
[2] *Ibid*, p. 21.
[3] *Ibid*, p. 20.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

Several federal laws and regulations apply to merit awards **given** or **administered** by an institution. Constitutional guarantees[1] and state laws may also apply. State human rights laws, for example, may be broader than Title IX and impose additional requirements.

The following federal laws are applicable:[2]

- **Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972** prohibiting sex discrimination against students and employees in institutions receiving federal assistance. **See chart, page 10.**

- **Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964** prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color and national origin in all institutions receiving federal assistance. Minority women students are protected by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act as well as by Title IX.

- **Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964** prohibiting discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or sex. Merit awards which involve employer-employee relationships between the institution and the student (such as a fellowship requiring work activities) or between an outside employer and the student (such as a paid internship for which a student is nominated by the institution) may also be covered by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. (Other federal prohibitions against discrimination in employment, such as Executive Order 11246, the Equal Pay Act, and in some instances the Constitution itself, may also apply.) Students and faculty are thus protected under Title VII from discriminatory treatment on the basis of sex in the competition for an award or fellowship which involves paid employment.[3]

- **The Age Discrimination Act of 1975**[4] prohibiting discrimination based on age in institutions receiving federal assistance. Age is not defined: the Act prohibits discrimination at any age. Age restrictions in financial aid are generally not permitted.[5] Discrimination on the basis of age must be justified in terms of the four specific exceptions in the Act itself.[6]

  Many merit awards restricted by age may be in violation of the Age Discrimination Act. Moreover, restrictions limiting awards eligibility to traditional college-age students may have a disproportionate effect on returning women students; restrictions limiting postdoctoral awards or other fellowship opportunities for professionals by age (for example, under 35) may have a disproportionate effect on women faculty whose careers may have been postponed or interrupted by childrearing.

- **Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973**[7] prohibiting discrimination against women (and men) on the basis of handicap in all institutions receiving federal assistance. Disabled individuals must be judged according to the same criteria as other awards candidates, unless a particular student's handicap makes him/her unable to qualify for or participate in the specific activity for which the award is targeted.

  Provisions governing restricted awards established under bequests, wills or trusts are similar to those of Title IX: that is, a college or university **may** administer monetary awards that discriminate on the basis of handicap **only** if the **overall effect** on an institution-wide basis is not discriminatory. (See Title IX chart, p. 10) Awards not established under a bequest, will or trust which are provided or administered by the institution may not discriminate on the basis of handicap, even if the overall effect is nondiscriminatory.

TITLE IX AND AWARDS AND PRIZES

AWARDS AND PRIZES ADMINISTERED BY THE INSTITUTION

Type of Award	*Institutional Responsibilities*
• **Financial[a] awards and prizes** which are established by domestic or foreign **wills, trusts, bequests** or similar legal instrument or by acts of a foreign government.	Single sex awards are permitted **provided** that the overall effect of such awards does not discriminate on the basis of sex. The institution must set up a pooling procedure to insure overall nondiscrimination.[b]
• **Financial[a] awards and prizes not established by a legal instrument** (and not athletic awards).	No single sex awards are permitted. However, in some instances, awards for one sex may be allowed where this can be justified to counter the effect of past discrimination. (See footnote 9.)
• **Financial[a] awards for study at a foreign institution,** such as scholarships, fellowships or other awards established by foreign or domestic wills, trusts, or similar legal instruments or by acts of foreign governments.	The institution may administer, or assist in administering, such programs only if the institution provides or otherwise makes available reasonable opportunities for similar awards for members of the opposite sex.[c]
• **Athletic scholarships.**	To the extent that an institution provides these awards or grants-in-aid, it must provide reasonable opportunities for such awards for members of each sex in proportion to the number of students of each sex participating in intercollegiate athletics. Separate athletic scholarships or grants-in-aid for members of each sex may be provided as part of separate athletic teams as allowed under Title IX, provided that overall proportionality of total scholarships is maintained.[d]
• **Athletic awards for excellence, performance,** etc., which are not considered financial aid.	Single sex awards are permitted when they are related to particular single-sex teams (such as an award for "the best football player") provided that the overall opportunities for each sex to win such awards are substantially equivalent. (Additionally, given the fact that there are often separate teams for each sex, it would seem likely that separate awards for the best male athlete and the best female athlete might be allowed.)
• **Non-monetary, non-athletic awards fully administered by the institution.**	Distinctions on the basis of sex are prohibited. (Thus, awards for the "best female English major" and "the best male English major" would likely be held illegal under Title IX, since some deserving students would be penalized on the basis of sex. For example, if the four best English majors were all of the same sex, only the first would win an award.)

AWARDS AND PRIZES ADMINISTERED OR ASSISTED IN PART BY THE INSTITUTION

• **Awards or prizes which are not considered financial aid** (whether or not established by a bequest, will, trust or other legal instrument) such as: $500 for the best manuscript, or a plaque for the best physics project.	Institutions cannot provide **significant assistance**[e] to any agency, organization or person which discriminates on the basis of sex. (The institution cannot assist another entity in doing something that would be illegal if done by the institution itself.)

AWARDS AND PRIZES *NOT* ADMINISTERED OR ASSISTED IN PART BY THE INSTITUTION

• **Awards, monetary or other, where the institution does not provide significant assistance.**	Single sex awards are not prohibited under Title IX; however, the entity awarding the aid may be covered on its own by state or federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination.

MARITAL AND PARENTAL STATUS

Title IX also prohibits an institution from applying any rule concerning a student's actual or potential parental, family or marital status which treats students differently on the basis of sex. Thus, for example, women students who are married cannot be formally or informally denied awards on that basis while married men are allowed to retain eligibility. Although the regulation would seem to allow the adoption of a rule or procedure which penalizes women and men equally because of marital or parental status—e.g., to restrict an award to unmarried students only—such a rule may be in violation of the Constitution.

Many awards and prizes—particularly those given through bequests, wills and trusts—are restricted to unmarried students and may be in violation of Title IX, both in letter and in spirit, to the extent that a disproportionate number of otherwise qualified married women students may thus be made ineligible. Moreover, awards which have "good character" as a criteria and which involve judgements or rules based on unwed pregnancy may also violate Title IX. (Constitutional issues, such as religious freedom, the right to have or not to have an abortion, and the right to marry or not marry may be involved as well.)

NOTES FOR CHART: TITLE IX AND AWARDS AND PRIZES

[a]Includes awards which provide items which have a money value, such as tuition and/or room and board.

[b]The institution first ranks eligible candidates according to nondiscriminatory criteria, then "pools" all available funds (whether sex-restricted or not) and finally allocates those funds, taking into consideration the sex of the student where sex-restricted awards are concerned. If, after allocation, there are students of one sex remaining who were eligible for an award but denied one because the remaining funds are restricted to students of the other sex, then the institution's administration of the wills and trusts involved has had the overall effect of discrimination on the basis of sex. In a memorandum accompanying Title IX, then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Caspar Weinberger, described the process governing financial assistance generally as follows:

> For example, if fifty students are selected by a university . . . the students should be ranked in the order in which they are to receive awards . . . (I)f award is based on academic excellence, those with the higher academic averages are placed at the top of the list. The list should then be given to the financial aid office which may match the student to the scholarships and other aid available, whether sex-restrictive or not. However, if, after the first twenty students have been matched with funds the . . . office runs out of non-restrictive funds and is left with only funds designated for men, those funds must be awarded without regard to sex and not solely to men unless only men are left on the list. If both men and women remain on the list, the university must locate additional funds or cease to give awards at that point.

Since Title IX requires that no otherwise eligible student be denied a comparable award because of lack of funds, it is likely that an institution would be obligated to find additional funds where the amount of single-sex awards was given disproportionately to either men or women. (For further discussion, see Charles E. Guerrier, *Title IX and the Achievement of Equal Education Opportunity: A Legal Handbook*, pp. 67-8. See "Selected List of Resources" for publication information.) Presumably, *departmental* merit awards established by bequest, will or trust must be handled in the same fashion.

[c]This provision was drafted with the concern that American men retain their eligibility to compete in the Rhodes Scholarship Program, which was not open to women until 1976 when the will of Cecil Rhodes was changed to comply with England's Sex Discrimination Act of that year.

[d]*Update on Title IX & Sports #3*, Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980. Note: Disparities in proportionality may be justified by a decision to phase in women's scholarships if appropriate for the development of women's teams, or to counter the effects of past discrimination in other ways.

[e]What constitutes "significant assistance" (so that the interrelationship of the entity and the school is such that the discriminatory practices of the entity can be attributed to the school) has not been fully defined. In a 1976 letter the former Director of The Office for Civil Rights, Martin Gerry, offered the following examples: providing meeting rooms; making available the school's mail service; providing space in the catalogue; making available free or discounted computer time; providing special recognition for members of the entity; providing or requiring a faculty sponsor. It is not clear whether providing single sex nominations to an outside entity violates Title IX. See also, *Wort v. Vierling*, C.D. Illinois, May 28, 1982 #82-3169.

DEALING WITH LEGAL ISSUES

- **Appoint a person, such as the Title IX coordinator, to ensure that awards procedures comply with federal and state laws and regulations barring discrimination.**
- **Include in all institutional awards material—such as announcements, brochures and application forms—a statement that the institution does not discriminate.**
- **Develop guidelines explaining provisions of federal and state law which prohibit discrimination in relation to awards and prizes, and distribute the guidelines to all persons on campus who deal with awards.**
- **In presenting information about Title IX to students—such as in the student handbook or during orientation sessions—make it clear that Title IX applies to awards (including scholarships, fellowships and grants) as well as to all other educational programs and activities.**
- **Evaluate and seek to change provisions which directly or indirectly discriminate on the basis of sex, age, marital status or disability in awards established by bequests, wills or trusts.** Such provisions can often be revised through negotiation with trustees or by requesting permission from the courts.[1]
- **Work with potential contributors of new awards established by bequests, wills, or trusts to ensure that provisions do not discriminate.**
- **Ensure that development officers are aware of the overall status of sex-restricted awards so if a contributor insists that a bequest be sex-restricted, the development officer can suggest how the bequest might fill existing gaps in single-sex awards.**
- **Establish merit awards for women, including minority and disabled women, in those areas where the establishment of such awards is necessary to counter the effects of past discrimination.**[2] (The Danforth Foundation, for example, established Graduate Fellowships for Women "who, because of delay or postponement in graduate work, no longer qualified for conventional programs or whose candidacy in such programs might have been given low priority."[3] While this Danforth program has been discontinued, other foundations as well as several institutions have established merit awards specifically for returning women students.)

NOTES FOR LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS SECTION

[1]See, for example, *University of Delaware Trustees v. Gebelein*, 420 A.2d 1191, Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle County, 1980, allowing the university to administer a charitable trust providing a scholarship for females.

[2]See, *Federal Laws and Regulations Concerning Sex Discrimination in Educational Institutions* (chart), Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1979.

[3]A class action suit under Title VII charging sex discrimination in the interview process for The White House Fellowship Program resulted in changes in the procedures and a subsequent increase in the number of women who received the fellowships. Brought by Dr. Serena Stier against The White House Fellows Commission in 1975, the suit was settled out of court. (For further discussion, see Nies, pp. 3, 12-13.)

[4]See also, *The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 and Women on Campus*, Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1978.

[5]See, *Financial Aid: Helping Re-entry Women Pay College Costs*, Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1980.

[6]Age Discrimination Act of 1975, 42 U.S.C. Section 6101-6107. The final government-wide regulation for The Age Discrimination Act can be found at 45 C.F.R. Part 90 and at 44 *Fed. Reg.* 33768-88 (June 12, 1979). The Act also requires each agency to issue agency-specific regulations. As of this writing, the Department of Education has not yet issued these regulations.

[7]For further discussion, see G. Richard Biehl, *Guide to the Section 504 Self-Evaluation Checklist for Colleges and Universities*, National Association of College and University Business Officers, Washington, DC, 1978, pp. 55-59.

[8]Often, trustees can petition for the application of *cy pres* [when the original intent of a charitable purpose becomes impossible, illegal, or outdated] as when a scholarship established to aid education generally was written in language that excluded women because of the milieu and the historical role of women at that time. (To date, most applications for *cy pres* have been made on grounds of race discrimination.)

In many instances, courts have been sympathetic to changing bequests, wills and trusts that are discriminatory. In Virginia Trust Company, as substitute trustee under the will of *Granville P. Meade* v. *Jose R. Davila, Jr., et al.* [Chancery Court of the City of Richamond, 1972, E.F. Drawer #8] the court ruled that provisions of a trust fund established in 1920 for the education of "young men of the white race" violated state and federal constitutional provisions barring discrimination on the basis of both sex and race. More recently, the Massachusetts State Supreme Court ruled that the phrase "young men" in a trust fund for educational scholarships included females as well as males and that aid should be provided to students of both sexes. [*Ebitz* v. *Pioneer National Bank*, 45 U.S.L.W. 2490 (1977)].

An institution and its contributors can also renegotiate the terms of a bequest, will or trust on their own. Yale University, for example, consulted with award sponsors to seek their agreement that awards designated as single-sex could be used for both men and women. For further discussion of *cy*

pres and other issues involving single-sex scholarships, see "Sex Restricted Scholarships and the Charitable Trust," *Iowa Law Review*, Vol. 59, 1975, pp. 1000-1029. See also footnote 1.

[9]Some recent court decisions have supported the legality of such single-sex awards. For example, in *University of Delaware Trustees* v. *Gebelein* (see footnote 1), the court ruled that the University could administer a charitable trust providing a scholarship for females only without violating the Constitution and referred to earlier cases in which the Supreme Court has upheld situations in which sex discrimination was "benign" and designed to recompense for past discrimination. (Title IX was apparently not at issue in this case.)

[10]Danforth Graduate Fellowships 1979-80, brochure, p. 3.

SELECTED LIST OF AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Although some sponsored programs have begun to evaluate their own awards procedures from the perspective of increasing women's participation, there has been very little general or institutional research in this area. Additional research is especially needed to help answer questions such as the following:

GENERAL RESEARCH

- **Are women more likely to win awards and prizes for which there are *fixed criteria*** (e.g., the highest undergraduate average in a given subject) **than prizes where criteria are *discretionary* and apt to be defined in relation to qualities and behaviors usually associated with men** (e.g., the student most likely to suceed)?
- **Are women more likely to be considered for and to win *departmental* prizes (where their *past* work is known by several faculty members) than prizes from larger units (divisions, schools, etc.) where *"potential"* rather than past performance is primarily evaluated?**
- **Are women as likely to be nominated for and to win prestigious sponsored awards and fellowships as they are to win on-campus awards and prizes?**
- **Are fewer women considered for awards and prizes when application nomination and selection procedures are handled informally than when procedures and guidelines have been established?**
- **What effect does serving as a nominator or judge have on the professional status of women faculty members both within their own institutions and in relation to wider professional networks?**
- **What are the short- and long-term effects of winning a merit award or fellowship on the educational and career ambitions and attainments of women students?**

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

- **Are women less likely than men to apply for and/or win awards on your campus?**
- **Has the number of women winners on your campus increased in proportion to the enrollment of women students?**
- **Is there a disparity between the number of women winners in traditionally male and traditionally female fields that is disproportionate to the number of women currently enrolled in these areas?**
- **Have minority women, older women and handicapped women applied for, been nominated for, and won institutional and/or sponsored awards and prizes?**
- **Have women faculty members—including minority and handicapped women—been invited to serve on nominating or judging panels? If your institution has a small pool of women faculty (particularly in nontraditional areas) has it sought women faculty from related areas or departments?**
- **Is research on women, sex-roles and related subjects considered as valuable as work in other areas for general research awards?**

HONORARY DEGREES

Although there are many women of outstanding achievement, women have infrequently been awarded honorary degrees, presidential medals, distinguished alumnae awards and similar kinds of recognition. Often, nominating committees for these prestigious prizes have few—if any—women members. Institutions may wish to review their recipients of these sorts of prizes over the past few years to see how many have been women, and to evaluate their nomination procedures in light of the recommendations in this paper.

SELECTED LIST OF RESOURCES

GENERAL AND LEGAL RESOURCES

College and University Personnel Association (CUPA). **Interview Guide for Supervisors**, 1981. Designed primarily for use in interviewing candidates for academic employment, this guide may also be helpful in establishing guidelines for interviewers on awards committees. It includes a description of questions which can and cannot be asked, and discusses a range of considerations involved in interviewing candidates from minority and other groups. Available prepaid for $1.50 (members), $2.00 (nonmembers) from CUPA, 11 Dupont Circle, Suite 120, Washington, DC 20036.

Gill, Margot N. **The Harvard Guide to Grants**, 1981. Published for Harvard-Radcliffe students, the **Guide** contains information about the major national and university fellowships administered by the Harvard University Office of Career Services and Off Campus Learning, as well as about other sources for grants and loans. The **Guide** also includes a discussion to help students define project goals, guidelines for writing grant proposals, and information about on-campus and other advisory resources available to Harvard-Radcliffe students. A useful model, the **Guide** is available for $10.00 from the Office of Career Services, Harvard University, 54 Dunster St., Cambridge, MA 02138.

Guerrier, Charles E. **Title IX and the Achievement of Equal Educational Opportunity: A Legal Handbook**, 1979. Provides an introduction to major issues related to Title IX and a section-by-section analysis annotated with references to case law. While merit awards and prizes are not treated as a separate subject, discussion includes study-abroad programs, institutional and off-campus financial assistance with description of pooling procedures and marital/parental status. Available for $10.00 single copy, $7.00 each for 25 or more from Resource Center on Sex Equity, Council of Chief State School Officers, 400 North Capitol St., N.W., Suite 379, Washington, DC 20001.

Lambert, Bonny and Sandler, Bernice R. **Giving Prizes and Awards: A New Way to Recognize and Encourage Activities that Promote Equity for Women in Academe**, 1981. Discusses ways in which institutions and sponsoring organizations can use awards and prizes to highlight programs that enhance equity on campus, includes guidelines for setting up an awards program, and notes model programs currently underway. Available for $1.00, prepaid, from the Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R St., NW, Washington, DC 20009.

Nies, Judith. **Women and Fellowships, 1981,** August 1981. Discusses barriers women often face in competing for awards, with an emphasis on prestigious sponsored fellowships and grants for faculty and professional women. Includes a brief list of general recommendations, a discussion of selected programs and an analysis of recipients by sex. Also includes suggestions for submitting an effective proposal and budget. Available for $3.50 from the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL), 805 15th St., NW, Suite 822, Washington, DC 20005.

Project on the Status and Education of Women. **Title IX Packet.** Nine papers on legal requirements and other implications of Title IX. Includes the pamphlet **Sex Discrimination Against Students: Implications of Title IX of**

...Education Amendments of 1972, 1975, which contains a discussion of evaluation criteria that may have a discriminatory impact on women. Packet available for $3.00, prepaid, from the Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R St., NW, Washington, DC 20009. [Informational packets **Title IX and Sports** and **Other Legal Requirements** (including an analysis of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975) may also be helpful. For a complete list of PSEW publications, send a self-addressed mailing label to the Project.]

RESOURCES FOR OUTREACH AND IDENTIFICATION

The following resource publications and organizations may be useful in devising outreach strategies targeted to women, as well as in identifying potential women panelists and participants.

American Association of University Women (AAUW). **Professional Women's Groups**, May 1981. Lists women's organizations as well as women's committees and caucuses within professional and educational associations. Available for $1.00 from the AAUW Program Department, 2401 Virginia Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20037, Attn: Emily S. Doherty, Asst. to the Director.

Federation of Organizations for Professional Women (FOPW). **A Woman's Yellow Pages**, 1981. Lists over 500 organizations concerned with women's issues, including names, addresses and contact persons where possible. Includes professional and trade associations. Available prepaid with a self-addressed mailing label, $4.00 per copy and $1.00 for postage and handling from FOPW, 2000 P St., NW, #403, Washington, DC 20036.

Focus on Minority Women's Advancement (**FMWA**). Program directed by the American Council on Education's (ACE) Office of Women in Higher Education in conjunction with its National Identification Program. Works to continue the identification of minority women administrators and to strengthen minority/women's networks in the higher education community. For further information, contact FMWA, Office of Women in Higher Education, ACE, 1 Dupont Circle, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

National Network of Minority Women in Science. Meets in conjunction with the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). For further information, contact Paula Quick Hall, Office of Opportunities in Science, AAAS, 1776 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036.

National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) and The Feminist Press. **Women's Studies Program List** and **Centers for Research on Women.** The first includes over 300 women's studies programs and the second offers information about 22 centers for research on women. Updated annually. Current lists to appear in the Fall 1982 edition of **The Women's Studies Quarterly.** Available for $3.50 prepaid from The Feminist Press, Box 334, Old Westbury, NY 11568.

Stanford University Office of Chicano Affairs. **National List of Chicano Contacts in Higher Education,** 1980. Includes male and female faculty, administrators and staff by state and institution. Available for $3.00, prepaid, from the Stanford Center for Chicano Research, Stanford University, P.O. Box 9341, Stanford, CA 94305. Checks should be made payable to Chicano Publications.

Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, **The Black Women's Educational Policy and Research Network.** Established to put researchers and policy makers in contact with each other on the issue of black women and girls' education. Runs seminars and publishes resource guides. Contact Patricia Bell Scott, Director, Black Women's Education Policy and Research Network, Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, MA 02181.

The Women's Research and Education Institute (WREI) of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues. **A Directory of Selected Women's Research and Policy Centers,** 1981. Lists centers with address, name of director or contact person, and additional information, such as whether the center publishes a newsletter. Available for mailing cost of 37¢ from WREI, 204 Fourth St., SE, Washington, DC 20003.

NOTES

[1]For a case in point, see Judith Glies, *Women and Fellowships 198*: Women's Equity Action League, Washington, DC, 1981, p. 6.

[2]Lake Erie College, Painesville, Ohio, has included this information in full page advertisements in popular national magazines.

[3]Michelle Patterson and Lucy Sells, "Women Dropouts from Higher Education," in Alice Rossi and Ann Calderwood, eds., *Academic Women on the Move*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, NY, 1973, pp. 88-89.

[4]See, for example, Elaine H. El-Khawas, "Differences in Academic Development During College" in *Men and Women Learning Together: A Study of College Students in the Late '70's*, Office of the Provost, Brown University, April 1980, pp. 7-8; Alexander W. Astin, *Four Critical Years: Effects of College on Beliefs, Attitudes and Knowledge*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 1977, p. 215; and Nancy F. Adler, "Women Students" in Joseph Katz and Rodney T. Harnett, eds., *Scholars in the Making: The Development of Graduate and Professional Students*, Ballinger Publishing Co., Cambridge, MA, 1976, especially pp. 215-216.

[5]For an overview of issues related to the evaluation of women, see Veronica F. Nieva and Barbara E. Gutek, "Sex Effects on Evaluation," *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1980, pp. 267-276.

[6]Nieva and Gutek, p. 268.

[7]While past studies showed that in many instances women were as likely as men to devalue other women's achievement, more recent research indicates that women—but not men—may be beginning to evaluate women more fairly. Compare, for example, Philip Goldberg, "Are Women Prejudiced Against Women?" *Trans-Action*, Vol. 5, 1968, pp. 28-30 and Irene H. Frieze, "Women's Attributions for and Causal Attributions of Success and Failure" in Martha T. Mednick, Sandra S. Tangri and Lois W. Hoffman, eds., *Women and Achievement: Social and Motivational Analyses*, Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, Washington, DC, 1975, pp. 167-68.

[8]Nieva and Gutek, p. 270; and Marla Beth Isaacs, "Sex Role Stereotyping and the Evaluation of the Performance of Women: Changing Trends," *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 6, No. 2, Winter 1981, pp. 188 and 192.

[9]See, A.R. Hochschild, "Inside the Clockwork of Male Careers," in *Women and the Power to Change*, ed. Florence Howe, McGraw Hill Book Co., New York, 1975; M.E. Tidball, "Of Men and Research: The Dominant Themes in American Higher Education Include Neither Teaching Nor Women," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 47, No. 4, 1976, pp. 373-89; and I.M. Heyman, *Women Students at Berkeley: Views and Data on Possible Sex Discrimination in Academic Programs*, University of California, Berkeley, June 1977 as cited in Jeanne J. Speizer, "Role Models, Mentors and Sponsors: The Elusive Concepts," *Signs*, Vol. 6, No. 4, Summer 1981, p. 698.

[10]Cynthia L. Attwood, *Women and Fellowship and Training Programs*, Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, Washington, DC, 1972, Appendix B, pp. 20-24, as cited in Nies, p. 6.

[11]Nies, p. 7.

[12]Nies, p. 8.

[13]Interview with Warren B. Martin, former Director, Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program.

[14]Mary P. Richards, "Women in Graduate Education," *Communicator*, Vol. XIII, No. 8, April, 1981, p. 10.

[15]See, for example, Jean Howard, "Final Report," in *Men and Women Learning Together: A Study of College Students in the Late '70's*, p. 269.

[16]See, for example, Adler (note 4), p. 206.

[17]Nieva and Gutek, pp. 270-271.

[18]Margot N. Gill, *The Harvard Guide to Grants*, Office of Career Services and Off Campus Learning, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 1981, p. 54.

[19]Quotation from Luce materials in description provided by George Washington University's Fellowship Information Center, Washington, DC.

[20]See, for example, Jayne E. Stake, Elaine F. Walker and Mary V. Speno "The Relationship of Sex and Academic Performance to Quality of Recommendations for Graduate School," *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 4, Summer 1981, p. 521.

[21]See, for example, Sheila K. Bennett, "Campus Cultures and the Visibility of Female Faculty: The Evidence of Student Evaluation of Male and Female Instructors," paper prepared for Pamela Perun, ed., *The Undergraduate Woman: Issues in Educational Equity*, Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Co., Indianapolis, IN, 1982, prepublication draft, p. 17.

[22]See, for example, Gill, p. 60.

[23]*Ibid*, p. 20.

[24]This correlation between sex of reference seeker and of referee has been demonstrated in a related context concerning letters of recommendation. Male referees tended to describe male students as being more motivated and having fewer weaknesses than women, while women referees did the opposite. See Stake, et al. (note 20).

[25]See, for example, Robin Lakoff, *Language and Women's Place*, Harper Colophon Books, Harper and Row, New York, NY, 1975.

[26]See, for example, Karen Bogart, "Technical Manual for the Institutional Self-Study Guide on Sex Equity," American Institutes for Research, 1981, Appendix C, unnumbered pages.

[27]Letter from Jon W. Fuller, President, Great Lakes Colleges Association to Roberta M. Hall, March 12, 1982.

[28]Nies, p. 7.

[29]For further discussion, see Roberta M. Hall, "The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One for Women?" Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, Washington, DC, 1982, pp. 9-10.

[30]Interviews with administrators of fellowship programs.

[31]The following discussion and recommendations are based on Margaret Dunkle, *Competitive Athletics: In Search of Equal Opportunity*, Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education, National Foundation for the Improve-

ment of Education, Washington, DC, 1976, pp. 93-94.

[32]*Ibid*, p. 93.

[33]See, for example, Nies discussion of the Nieman Fellowships in Journalism, pp. 9-10; White House Followships, pp. 13-14; and the Alfred P. Sloan Fellows Program, pp. 19-20.

[34]Many of the following recommendations are adapted from guidelines sent to Liaison Officers for the Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program in 1979.

[35]Many disciplinary associations and other organizations (such as the American Council on Education's Office of Women's National Identification Program) have compiled lists of outstanding women scholars and/or administrators. The importance of tapping sources developed in this manner is underscored by recent changes in NEH's panelist selection procedures. According to Alison Bernstein of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, during the early 1970's women scholars applied to the Endowments, but rarely got grants. The Women's Equity Action League identified as the major obstacle a peer review procedure which did not include women. Simultaneously, a directory of women's studies faculty was compiled by *The Feminist Press* under a grant from The Ford Foundation. This directory helped provide names for the Endowment's now-computerized bank of panelists. For further discussion, see Alison R. Bernstien, "Funding for Women's Higher Education: Looking Backward and Ahead," *Grants* Magazine, Vol. 4, No. 4, December 1981, p. 227.

[36]Interview, former director, national fellowship program.

[37]Many of the ideas and examples discussed in this section are based on conversations and correspondence with Pamela E. Kramer, Director of Women's Programs and Associate Professor of Psychology, Polytechnic Institute (NY).

[38]For a detailed discussion of the institutional and attitudinal barriers returning women students often face, see the series of papers on re-entry women published by the Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, Washington, DC, 1980-81, especially "The Counseling Needs of Re-entry Women."

[39]See, for example, Adelaide Simpson, "A Perspective on the Learning Experiences of Black Students at VCU (Virginia Commonwealth University)," unpublished paper, The Center for Improving Teaching Effectiveness, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1979, p. 3; and Hall, "The Classroom Climate," (note 29) p. 12.

[40]Kramer (note 37).

[41]For a brief general review of race and sex differences in communication, see Nancy M. Henley, *Body Politics: Power, Sex and Nonverbal Communication*, Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1977, pp. 132-35.

[42]Many of the issues and recommendations discussed in this section are based on correspondence with Ann Cupolo, Deputy Coordinator, Disabled Women's Educational Equity Project, Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, Berkeley, CA.

[43]For further discussion, see Roberta M. Hull, "Re-entry Women: Special Programs for Special Populations," Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, Washington, DC, 1981, pp. 5ff.

[44]Description of criteria for Rhodes Scholarship in Gill, p. 54.

AUGUST, 1982

This paper was developed under Grant #G008103201 from the Women's Educational Equity Act Program of the U.S. Department of Education. Opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or the policy of the Department of Education, or the Association of American Colleges. The Project is funded by Carnegie Corporation of New York and The Ford Foundation. Individual copies of this paper are available in a packet of information on Prizes and Awards. This packet may be obtained for $2.00 from the Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R St., NW, Washington, DC 20009, (202) 387-1300. (A list of all Project publications is available free with a self-addressed mailing label.) Bulk rates are available.

Copyright © 1982 by the Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges